



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 3, 2003

Mr. J. Kevin Patteson
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2003-7891

Dear Mr. Patteson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 190800.

The Office of the Governor received a request for information relating to Proposition 12, which appeared on the September 13, 2003 constitutional ballot, to include twelve specified categories of records. You indicate that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

As a preliminary matter, we note you have only submitted a small amount of information for review by this office. We therefore assume that, to the extent additional responsive information exists, you do not seek to withhold such information from disclosure and have released it to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (concluding that section 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be released as soon as possible under the circumstances).

¹We note that in your submission to this office of September 5, 2003, you raised section 552.106 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. As you do not contend that the information at issue is excepted under section 552.106 in your submission of September 11, 2003, we presume that you no longer intend to claim section 552.106 as an exception to disclosure. Accordingly, we do not address the applicability of section 552.106 in the present ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A).

With respect to the submitted information, we address your claimed exceptions to disclosure. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

In this case, you advise that the submitted information consists of communications between staff of the Office of the Governor and an attorney in the General Counsel division. You state that the information at issue consists of legal advice and opinion communicated in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the Office of the Governor, and you advise that the confidentiality of the information has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the information is protected by the attorney-client privilege. We therefore conclude that the Office of the Governor may withhold the submitted information in its entirety pursuant to section 552.107

of the Government Code. Based on this finding, we do not reach your argument under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge

this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Saldivar', with a stylized flourish at the end.

David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 190800

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Dan Lambe
Texas Watch
1300 Guadalupe Street, Suite 108
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)